

# RIGHTEOUSNESS BY FAITH;

OR THE

Nature and Means of our Justification before God;

ILLUSTRATED BY A COMPARISON OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE  
OXFORD TRACTS

WITH THAT OF THE

ROMISH AND ANGLICAN CHURCHES.

A NEW AND REVISED EDITION OF "OXFORD DIVINITY."

BY

CHARLES PETTIT M'ILVAINE, D.D., D.C.L.

BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE DIOCESE OF OHIO.

---

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL BOOK SOCIETY

IN

PHILADELPHIA:

1224 CHESTNUT STREET,

1862.

---

Entered, according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1861, by the  
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL BOOK SOCIETY,  
In the Clerk's office of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

---

S. D. WYETH, Agt., Stereotyper.  
No. 522 Minor St., Phila.

---

---

COLLINS, PRINTER.

---

	PAGE
PREFACE TO THE PRESENT EDITION, - - -	5
PREFACE, - - - - -	24
CONTENTS, - - - - -	31
RIGHTEOUSNESS BY FAITH, - - - - -	37
CHIEF DANGER OF THE CHURCH IN THESE TIMES, - -	
EPISCOPAL CHARGE IN 1843, - - - - -	395
REASONS FOR REFUSING TO CONSECRATE A CHURCH - -	
HAVING AN ALTAR INSTEAD OF A COMMUNION TABLE, -	425



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2017 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

## PREFACE TO THE PRESENT EDITION.

It will be seen by the Title-page that this volume is only a revised and improved edition of what has heretofore been known under the name of "Oxford Divinity." At this period in the history of a controversy which that name suggests, it is not supposed that, though the previous editions in this country and England are exhausted, there is any such demand for another as would justify the expense as a book-selling enterprise. There is a demand however, which has induced many zealous advocates of the great truths which the book maintains to desire its reprint, and which has prevailed with one of them to provide the means of perpetuating it in stereotype.

The author has been much more richly rewarded for his pains than ever he had expected to be. Instances in England and at home, in which God has graciously used it as the means of arresting a dangerous progress towards the full embracing of Romanism, under the teaching of the Oxford Tracts, or of kindred works; many more instances in which it has been honoured in the promotion of a greatly increased clearness, decision, and spiritual discrimination, in the holding and teaching of these great central doctrines of the way of salvation, the denial of which is the parent of all Romish corruptions of gospel truth, have come to his knowledge, and have been subjects of great thankfulness on his part to Him who puts his treasure "in earthen vessels that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us."

But is not the work of this volume finished? Is not the controversy which gave it birth ended, or so fast expiring, and so nearly dead, that there need be no further fear of its influence? Has not its place been taken by a far more portentous evil, another Oxford Divinity, and another school of Tractarians, of a perfectly opposite character, and which, instead of promulgating only a corruption of Christianity, proclaims its virtual denial, even a vaunt-

ing and sceptical Rationalism, that stalks abroad on the high places of preferment in church and university, a striking imitation of those primitive adversaries of the Gospel, to whose philosophic wisdom its central distinguishing facts and truths were "foolishness?"

We have not failed to take due notice of the rise and progress of this new school—new in certain respects; but still nothing more, in substance, than what the "evil heart of unbelief" has often raised up before, and "the power and wisdom of God" in Christ have often overcome. It is nothing more than a fresh, aspiring shoot from the decayed stock of that German rationalism, which having flourished at one time on the continent, in such pride, is now fast yielding to the revival of the Gospel. It is but an insidious form of that very Deism which, with more honest avowal of its nature and aims, sought to uproot Christianity in the times of Hobbes and Collins and Herbert and Tindal. We yield to none in our estimate of the unmixed evil, and the great danger of this new form of opposition to the gospel; especially its bare-faced dishonesty, in having for its leaders men who profess to be Christian ministers and occupy the places and enjoy the emoluments of clergymen of the Church of England. We trust that our venerable mother Church, by her righteous discipline, will cleanse herself of such dishonour. Shall indeed infidelity be allowed to speak from the pulpits of her churches and the chairs of her universities? Shall men be allowed to preside over her great schools and venerable colleges, and live on endowments consecrated to the education of her youth in the ways of the Gospel, while they conspire together to bring into contempt and rejection all that she holds most vital and precious in the scriptures? Shall Unitarians have cause to taunt us with the boast, not only that what they call "eminent divines" of the Church of England, are avowing and propagating just *their* worst doctrines, but that in doing so, they have the sanction of Church-authorities and the patronage of their great University, since no decree silences—nor discipline ejects them? For the honour of the Gospel—the honour of the Church of England among whose children the Gospel is now having such

precious fruit—for the interests of true religion, wherever her influence is felt, we trust not.

But because this school of rationalistic scepticism has thus arisen in the very halls where the Tractarian first appeared, and is now attracting so much attention that the remaining representatives of the latter are likely to be lost sight of, let it not be supposed that Tractarianism has no representation which need be watched, nor strength still to do great harm; that its evil doctrines are not by dangerous and zealous teachers still busily propagated; or that there are not classes and conditions of mind, wherever we go, in which its seed would find congenial soil and rapidly take root.

Because it has been signally defeated on the field of argument, it is too much taken for granted that its powers of mischief have been subdued. But had the Canaanites no power to trouble Israel and lead the victorious people into idolatry, after their strongholds had been taken and their land was in possession of the tribes? "The Canaanite was yet in the land;" defeated, but not slain; restrained, but not changed.

One thing is certain. The present advocates of the Tractarian system, do not think it defunct or likely soon to be so. They work it and glory in it, as a leaven that is spreading its influence; a tree that is multiplying its fruit. In a measure, we agree with them. It may be perfectly true that it has lost its first positions; that in the defection of so many of its chief leaders to avowed Popery, in spite of their strong anti-papal protestations, it has suffered great disgrace; that now we hear little of new converts to it, or by it to Rome; that the press has ceased to teem with its publications, and the magazines to make battle, in its favor or against it; that what it does, is done far more noiselessly, and secretly than formerly, far more as the sapper underground, than as a combatant in open field. And yet it may be just as true that it is still doing a very evil work; leading many souls astray; spreading a vast deal of false religion; preparing a great breadth of ground for a future harvest of popery; educating numbers of aspirants for the ministry whose preaching will be that of "another gospel;" yea, and planting trees of which even Rationalism, just



such as we now deplore, will be the genuine fruit. The old Upas tree may be standing no longer on its original roots; the old trunk may have perished; but its branches have taken root and become trees, and are sending out *their* branches to become, in their turn, a spreading contamination.

In our estimate of the present condition of Tractarianism, we must not mistake change of policy for decrease of zeal, or of influence. When at first the system had need to be strongly inaugurated in the public view, it came forth with an array of high pretending publications, bold in assumption, reckless in argument, promising wonders. Volume followed volume. A great flourish of trumpets announced the entrance of a great Reformation of the Reformed. Controversy was challenged to give notoriety. Controversy arose, at least as much as was desired. But now there is a marked change in the bearing of the system so introduced. Of a great deal that was first professed, we hear no more. It had its day and its use. Of many denials of what it was charged with and many strong professions of being the only safe ground of real Protestantism in distinction from "*Ultra* Protestantism," we hear no more. Of elaborate self-vindication the press now furnishes exceeding little. The silence of the *mine* has succeeded to the noise of the assault. The sower quietly sowing his seed, has succeeded to the soldiery storming a fortress. The latter gained a field and the former is now tilling it. Bustle had once its day. Quietness has it now. It was once desirable to draw the public gaze. It is better now to work away from it. The strategy has changed—not the enemy; the policy, not the cause.

The present plan is to promote a taste for a *cereemonial* sensuous religion; for church ornament, pomp, symbolism, mystery and ritual, multiplied into the details of church furniture, ministerial vestments, clerical postures, and the like; under such fascinations, quietly to introduce and make fast the whole Sacerdotal system of Priesthood, Sacrifice, Altar, and the *opus operatum* of Baptismal efficacy. That system teaches the church as the depositary of saving grace; Sacraments as the only channels of that grace to the soul; Ministers of Sacraments as the only dispensers of that grace by those channels;



those Ministers real Priests, offerers of real sacrifice—of sacrifice by which comes remission of sins; those Priests officiating at a real *altar*, and in so doing, performing the office of *mediators* from man to God—by whom the people, through Christ, draw nigh to God, and without whose priestly mediation the approach of the people is at least imperfect and doubtful. The *Priest* at the altar offering sacrifice for the people, is represented as the prime and essential aspect of the Gospel Minister. The *Preacher* in the pulpit, teaching and preaching Jesus Christ to the people, is studiously, though stealthily, represented as in a position and work quite subordinate and incidental. All this, of course, is of the very essence of Popery. Against it, every nerve in the heart of true Protestantism is braced. Get it once inaugurated, and Popery has all its way prepared. It will argue and prove and branch out its whole array of doctrine and service from that central instalment. It is a sort of thing that may grow up among a people not preoccupied with decided and intelligent views of a contrary sort, without any very observable effort to convince them of it. It is insinuated, rather than enforced. It is asserted in the habitual language as if a thing of course. The people lose sight of the fact that any in our church, of any just pretence to true churchmanship, ever think otherwise. All that their eyes see, in the arrangement and furniture of the place of worship, and in the ways of the officiating minister is intended to train their minds in that one direction. In certain quarters, and under certain ministers, the people hear no more of the *communion table*. It is now “*the Altar*.” One sees no more, in such quarters, of any thing for the Lord’s Supper that looks like a *table*, and that conveys the idea of a feast; but in place of it what is studiously fashioned to look like an *altar*, that it may convey the idea of priesthood and sacrifice. That this altar, as such, with its associated ideas, may be the one object in the sight of the people, the pulpit is often placed in a very inferior position, without reference to the convenience of speaking or hearing. The reading-desk is put on one side—and the reader is made to read side-ways, as regards the people, lest by facing them he should turn his back to the chancel and to the eminent

sacredness of what has no right to be there, *the altar*. The minister's private prayer before beginning the service or sermon, which he used to offer in the desk and pulpit, is now offered at the chancel before *the altar*. There is, in all such things, and in divers other more minute things, a constant, silent, impressive and insinuating teaching, under which the people are gradually educated to the idea that in the chancel there is a presence of the Lord such as is no where else in the church or in the earth; that grace is thence specially dispensed and thither the worshipper is specially to look, because there stands the Priest at the Altar, offering sacrifice for the sins of the people, (through the offering of the body of Jesus,) by whose priestly mediation the sacrifice of Jesus becomes efficacious for remission of their sins.

Need we tell any careful observer, how much of all this is going on among us in various parts; how successfully it is advancing from general impression to positive belief; how many have got so far as to suppose it the very essence of churchmanship, almost regarding the rubrics of the communion office, which so pertinaciously adhere to the word *table*, and do not so much as indicate the possibility of an altar in a Protestant Church, as behind the age and of a churchmanship decidedly too low? It is no unimportant indication of the progress thus being made, that with so many of the clergy of this country, when a new church is built, or an old one repaired, if in the latter there used to be a *table*, (what good Bishop Ridley in his Injunctions for the removal of altars calls "an *honest table*," ) it is seen no more. "Old things are passed away," and the thing placed in the chancel is studiously made to look as little like a table and as much like an altar as possible. Nothing else would express their doctrine of the Sacrament, or satisfy their sacerdotal aspirations. Sometimes we would fain believe there is no very special design in it, but only a sort of sentimentalism which pleads no excuse but that of architectural gratification. But the direction is the same, and so the influence. We are told that the *form* is of little account. Very well. But then why so eager to change the old, time honoured, form, which certainly accords with the reiterated name, *table*, in the rubrics of the communion

office, far better than its recently introduced and obnoxious substitute? We are told that what is *used* as a table, *is* a table no matter what its form, and why complain because it has not the form of a table?

Try the question upon a surplice. Any outer garment *used* as a surplice *is* a surplice, no matter what the form or colour. Why then if some of our clergy should choose to wear some tastily contrived vestment, (tastily we mean in the tailor's eye) but as unlike as possible what is meant when we speak of a surplice, why take any exception? The form is indifferent. The use makes the thing. We venture to say there would be some sense of the value in some things, of a certain form, among those who plead the above excuse, should they witness such a garment under the profession and use of a surplice. But we have no hesitation in asserting that there could be no wrong in the use of the most inappropriate form of vestment for a surplice, in celebrating the Lord's Supper, comparable with that of substituting the form of a Romish altar for that of a proper table. That outlandish surplice, however repulsive to all right views of the fitness of things, would be only inappropriate. It would teach symbolically no false doctrine. It would contradict no great truth contained and taught in the Lord's Supper. It would be an offence, but not a heresy. But to cast out the table and substitute the shape of a Romish altar does teach symbolically a most unscriptural and pernicious doctrine, directly contradicting the true nature of the Lord's Supper and all the teaching of our church concerning it and the office of the ministry connected with it. Romanists well understand how *table* and *altar* represent respectively the Protestant and Romish faith concerning the Lord's Supper. One of their learned men, a chief hand in their Rhemish translation of the New Testament (Gregory Martin) says: "The name of *altar*, both in the Hebrew and Greek, and by the consent of all peoples, both Jews and Pagans, implying and importing *sacrifice*, therefore we, in respect of the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, say *altar* rather than *table*. But the Protestants because they make it a *supper* and no *sacrifice* therefore they call it a *table* only—to take away the holy sacrifice of the mass, they take away both altar

and priest; because they know right well that these three, priest, sacrifice and altar, are *dependents and consequents, so that they cannot be separated.*"\*

Nothing can be more out of place, in this question, than to speak of the indifference of the *form*; especially when such speech comes from those who are so zealous to get rid of the old form and, the almost universal form till recently, in our churches, and to substitute that very form which in the English church, after the reformation, was by authority every where cast out, the very name of it being erased from the Prayer Book. There is intended to be a symbolical expression of important truth in the table which wholly depends on its having a table-form. The form is the whole of it. Indifference to that, is indifference to the truth. Put an altar-form in its place, and you teach by a striking and well understood expression a most opposing and important error.

Now the extent to which that substitution is made in our churches; the zeal in many clergymen to have it done, not as a mere matter of architectural taste, but of symbolical teaching; the degree to which it is regarded as the legitimate expression of a true church spirit, by those who favour it; and the little notice now taken, among those who object in principle to the whole system with which it is connected, of a studied purpose to extend in our church the whole theory and practice of Priest, Sacrifice and Altar—so that what a few years ago would have excited a general indignation as evidence of tendencies to be sternly resisted, is now so familiar that it passes without rebuke and almost without remark; all this should surely teach us that Tractarianism in its main evil and tendency, whatever may have become of the Oxford Tracts, is living yet; a leaven at work and too successful to be unheeded.

This Preface was begun with some remarks on the recent outbreak of Rationalism in the church of England. The new school of Oxford divines, seems to many not only to have no affinity to its immediate predecessor, but as its opposite extreme, just as to such minds Italian Popery and German Neology seem antipodes,

\* Fulke's Defence of the English Translation of the Bible. Park. Soc. Ed. pp. 515, &c.



the latter degrading reason into slavish subjection to the authority of church decrees, the former exalting it above the authority of inspired scripture. In many respects, undoubtedly, the Tractarian and the Rationalist are in opposition. But as extremes sometimes meet; so have they sometimes the same beginning.

We are far from supposing that the offensive Rationalism of the famous "Essays and Reviews," by seven Members of the University of Oxford, is not strongly condemned by those who have succeeded to the authors of the Oxford Tracts, as leaders in the system they set up. We do not know, nor do we care to enquire whether any of the seven Rationalist Captains, or any of their recruits, were ever enlisted under the banner of Tractarianism.

But we maintain that there is ground common to the two schools and so fundamental in each, that it is perfectly intelligible how the teaching of the first Oxford school should have prepared the way for, and laid the foundations of, the second. We maintain that the former, in educating minds for its own conclusions, created a state of opinion which, if it failed to mature into Tractarianism, most naturally developed itself in Rationalism. We maintain that the Tractarians are logically connected, as cause and effect, with the seven Essayists—or rather with the preparedness of many to adopt their views; precisely as the Popery of Italy is accountable for the infidelity of Italy; or as the infidel school of France, in the last century, was a re-action from the whole dominion of ultramontane Romanism.

One thing is certain that when the Tract-school was in its first years, there were not wanting those who so read its tendencies as to predict a rise of Rationalism from the soil it would prepare. The present author so predicted, from its depreciation of the Inspiration of the Scriptures in its attempt, like the Church of Rome, to elevate a so called inspiration, abiding in the Church, into equal authority with that of the Bible; especially from its dishonouring the Scriptures as the only Rule of Faith by uniting with them, as of equal inspiration and authority, the traditions of the Church. It was not difficult to see how minds might easily be led so far by such teaching as to place the inspira-

tion and authority of the Scriptures upon the level of traditions and councils, and yet deny that in the confusion and contradictions of the latter there is any real inspiration or authority at all.

Sixteen years ago Archbishop Whately compared the Tractarian system with the Rationalism of Germany, and wrote as follows: "Among those who express the greatest dread and detestation of 'German Neology,' 'German Philosophy,' 'the daring speculations of the German,' &c., are to be found some of that class of Anglican Divines, whose doctrines apparently correspond the most closely (as far as we can judge respecting two confessedly mystic schools,) with those of that very Neology. The very circumstance itself that both are schools of Mysticism; that both parties have one system for the mass of mankind, and another, whether expressed in different language, or in the same words, understood in a different sense, for the initiated, affords a presumption when there are some points of coincidence in the doctrine *divulged*, that a still further agreement may be expected in the *reserved* doctrines.

"As the advocates of Reserve among us speak of not intending to inculcate *generally* such conclusions as a logical reasoner will correctly deduce by following out their principles, and speak of an ordinary reader being likely 'to miss their real meaning by not being aware of the peculiar sense in which they employ terms,' so those German Transcendentalists whom I allude to, whose system of Theology, or rather of Atheology, is little else than a new edition of the Pantheism of the ancient Heathen Philosophers, of the Brahmans and the Buddhists, use similar double-meaning language. They profess Christianity, and employ profusely such terms as a 'God,' 'Faith,' 'Incarnation,' 'Miracle,' 'Immortality,' &c., attaching to these words, a meaning quite remote from what is commonly understood by them.

"Both parties, decry the historical evidence of Christianity, and discourage all appeal to evidence; and both disparage Miracles considered as a proof of the divine origin of Christianity; alleging that *every* event that occurs is equally a miracle: meaning therefore exactly what in ordinary language would be expressed by saying that *nothing* is miraculous.

“Other coincidences may be observed ; such as the strong desire manifested by both parties to explain away or soften down the line of demarcation between what ordinary Christians call the *scriptures*, and every thing subsequent ; between what we call the Christian Revelation, considered as an historical transaction recorded in the New Testament, and any pretended after-revelation or improvement or completion or perfect development of ‘the system of true Religion.’ To Christianity, as a *Revelation* completed in our sacred *books*, both parties, more or less openly, according to circumstances, confess their objection. And it is remarkable that even the vehement censures pronounced by one of these schools, on the speculations of the other, is far from being inconsistent with their fundamental agreement in principles.”\*

About the year 1850 appeared “The Nemesis of Faith,” by F. A. Fronde, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford ; a near relative, and if we mistake not, a brother of the Fronde who once figured so prominently as a Tractarian leader.† The London Christian Observer, for March 1850, speaking of that book said : “Rumours had long been rife of a re-action at both the Universities, but more particularly at Oxford, against the principles and doctrines of the Tractarian self-styled Anglo-Catholic school. This new movement was understood to be Rationalistic, if not decidedly sceptical. And not a few of the immediate disciples of the most eminent Tract writers were said to be the chief oracles of coteries, in which, to use an expression reported to be current amog them, *the historic truth of Christianity was considered an open question*. When therefore a volume was announced from the pen of a Fellow of a college in Oxford, of a name signalized in the university by the history of his near relative, and bearing in its ominous title, evident allusion to a *reactionary movement* of a retributive character, the expecta-

\* Kingdom of Christ. App. to Essay II., Note P. See the tendency to Infidelity in the Tractarian doctrine of *Reserve*, most forcibly shown in the Archbishop’s “Cautions for the Times.” Nos. XII., and XIII.

† It is not unworthy of Note, that of the two Frondes, one became an extreme Tractarian, the other an extreme Rationalist ; and that of the two Newmans, the brothers Henry and Francis, the former became a Romish Priest—the latter a confirmed sceptic.



tion was very natural that it would turn out to be the exponent of Oxford scepticism, *disclosing its origin*, its present state, its observed results, its probable tendencies. The perusal of the book satisfied most of its readers, of the correctness of their 'foregone conclusion,' that such an exposition was intended by the author."

The book thus exhibiting the reaction of Tractarianism, was in 1850 substantially, in point of scepticism, what the "Essays and Reviews," are to-day. The following succinct account answers as well for the latter, as the former. "Let our readers imagine a work, evidently written for the purpose of showing the reasonableness of modern infidelity, in which the most prominent objections to the inspiration of the Old Testament, are borrowed from Thomas Paine; the great argument of Butler mentioned only to be dismissed as insufficient and irrelevant; Paley, treated with unmitigated contempt, and the sophistries of Hume and the slander of Gibbon, with correlative respect; and to crown the whole, the vast mass of internal evidences, accumulated principally in our times, and still rapidly increasing, absolutely ignored,—and he has the work of Mr. Fronde before him."\* We add, he has the general character of the Rationalism of the "Essays and Reviews." It is to be much desired that some such expression may be witnessed at Oxford concerning the latter, as was seen in connection with the former. The "Nemesis of Faith," was treated with an Auto da Fé in the Lecture room of its author's own college, and he found it necessary to resign his fellowship.

If it had been the settled purpose of the Tractarian writers, covertly to prepare the way for, and ultimately to introduce and educate, a school of just such Rationalism as that now attracting the attention of all England, they could not have acted more wisely for their object, than they did in some of the chief positions they assumed and much of the policy they used.

To make Faith in the Inspiration of the Scriptures rest on evidence merely, or to believe in a doctrine as divine, only in proportion to the evidence that it is found in Scripture; to make Christianity depend on what are called "the Evidences;" to make the

\* London Christian Observer.

study of the latter in any way, a road to belief, is treated with derision and represented as exceedingly dangerous to faith. The reply of "the uninstructed peasant," who to the question *why he believes* answered "because I have been told so by persons wiser and better than myself" is espoused by one of the writers as so very wise, that "there is nothing to be compared with its logic, either intellectually or morally or religiously in all the elaborate defences and evidences which could be produced from Paley and Grotius and Sumner and Chalmers."\* Another says that "Nature certainly does give sentence against a habit of enquiry, in that by the confession of all, happiness is attached to confiding *unreasoning faith*."† It is very instructive, in view of the reasonings, and doubtings and unbeliefs of the seven Essays, to read the 85th of the Oxford Tracts. It would seem as if it were written for the express purpose of breaking up ground, clearing away obstacles, undermining beliefs, insinuating doubts, and by a general unsettling of peoples' minds, to make all ready for the bolder and more unmasked entrance of Rationalism. Difficulties to faith are stated at least in full strength; evidences for faith to rest on, are most unjustly depreciated; objections to various parts of Scripture, the very parts to which the objections of the Essays are made, are broadly stated, and either not attempted to be set aside, or so feebly answered, as to be really strengthened. The Tract proceeds throughout on the abominable assumption that all parts and particulars of what it calls "the Church-system," namely its own doctrines of Apostolic Succession, of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, of Church Union, Absolution, Ministerial Power, &c.,—*as well as the doctrine of the Trinity, of the Atonement, Original Sin, the Inspiration of the New Testament*, are so on a level in point of scriptural evidence—all so "*latent*" in the scriptures; none "on the surface;" so few texts for any—and those so indireet and circuitous in their application—their proof so "*oblique*"—and the conclusion in favour of all alike being at best only "*a balance*" on their side, that if we conclude against the one we must, to be consistent, conclude against all. Thus the Atonement must be rejected, if you

\* British Critic.

† Tract 85.

will not believe in the divine warrant for what the Tractarian means by Absolution; the Trinity, if you reject his Apostolical Succession.

What, we ask, is the tendency of such a sentence as the following: "Consider whether the doctrine of the Atonement may not be explained away, by those who explain away the doctrine of the Eucharist,"—the Tractarian doctrine of the Eucharist. What is the tendency of the following? "If we will not content ourselves with mere probable, or (what we may be disposed to call) insufficient proofs of matters of faith and worship, we must become either Latitudinarians," that is, as before defined, we must believe that the scriptures contain "nothing that can be made the subject of belief at all,"—"or else Papists." Thus the necessity is plainly given, either to believe the great matters of faith without what we should call sufficient evidence of scripture, or become Papists, getting our convictions outside of the Scriptures, or else just what so many who used to read those Tracts have become, Rationalists—Sceptics.

Again; what is the tendency of such passages as the following? "If it be a good argument against the truth of the Apostolical Succession and similar doctrines, that so little is said about them in Scripture, this is quite as good an argument against nearly all the doctrines which are held by any who is called a christian, in any sense of the word." Or thus, "God has given us doctrines which are but obscurely gathered from scripture and a scripture which is but obscurely gathered from history," a *Revelation* obscure in its *substance*, obscure in its *evidences*! All the great doctrines of eternal life are here included in the obscurity. Again; "Doubt and difficulty as regards evidence, seems our lot. The simple question is what is our duty under it? Difficulty is our lot, as far as we take on ourselves to enquire." "If we will not allow evidence to be sufficient which merely results in a balance on the side of revelation—if we will not go by evidence in which there are (so to say,) *three chances for revelation, and only two against, we cannot be Christians.*"

Most worthy of all this playing into the hands of scepticism

is the conclusion of the Tract. "Why should not the church be divine? The burden of proof surely is on the other side. I will accept her doctrines, her rites and *her* Bible; not one, and not the other, but all—till I have a clear proof that she is mistaken. I love *her* Bible, *her* doctrines and *her* rites, and *therefore* I BELIEVE." These last emphatic marks are those of the Tract. And herein is the conclusion of the whole matter and the key to all the Tract. *The Church! her Bible, her doctrines, &c.* Our ground of faith is not evidence; not because such and such doctrines are to our eyes contained in Scripture; not because we see conclusive evidence that the scriptures are inspired, but *we love* and therefore we *believe*. But we love what? Why first the Church, and because the Bible is *her* Bible we love the Bible and the doctrines are *her* doctrines, therefore we love them, and loving we believe. To bring us thus to the Church as the Warrant and Determiner of faith; to make us feel that if we look to evidence we must launch to sea in open boat without chart, compass, or star, and be always driven to and fro by currents of doubt and winds of doctrine, in constant danger of being stranded on shoals and reefs of difficulty; that we can have refuge or quiet of mind only by sitting down under the shadow of the Church's authority, in the obedience of an unreasoning, implicit, unenquiring faith, taking all things, doctrine and rite, the Trinity, the Atonement, Absolution, Church Unity, (meaning of course Papal Unity,) Apostolical Succession, &c., on precisely the same warrant, namely, *the Church says so*, (meaning *what Church*, let the reader consider,) such was the single object of this insidious Tract. But what if its readers should be willing to be led just so far as to take in all its suggested doubts and be perplexed by all its suggested difficulties, and believe the doctrines of the Gospel to be so doubtfully contained in scripture and scripture so doubtfully proved by historical or internal evidence, and there stop and refuse to be guided any further by this *ductor dubitantium*? What if the doubter should have no mind to believe the Church till he can first believe the scriptures on which all its being depends and which he has already learned to doubt? He is landed in Rationalism or Infidelity. The whole remedy proposed for the doubts attempted to



be raised is exactly what the Tract calls it "a *kill or cure remedy*." If taken at all it must make Tractarians Romanists or it must make Rationalistic Sceptics. We do not wonder that the Tract writer should have said, "I predict as a coming event that minds are to be unsettled as to what is scripture and what is not." The prediction is now abundantly fulfilled. But it was the calculator of causes and effects, not the eye of a prophet that made it. That such a seed bed should have produced such growths, is certainly not surprising. If, while some ripened into a concealed or avowed Romanism, others went to seed before they got that far, and in another generation have come forth an indigenous crop of well marked Rationalism, where is the wonder?

But let us take another view. The doctrine of *Development* belongs to the Tractarian system, as well as to the Romish. To justify belief in a certain doctrine as of divine authority, as *contained* in Scripture and properly an article of Faith *to us*, it is not necessary (we read,) that it be capable of proof from the scriptures, nor that to any eye there should be even the appearance of it in the scriptures. It is not necessary that it should have had any place in the creed of the early church. Nay, it may have been expressly condemned in the early church as unscriptural. The invisible germ of it may be in the scriptures, and yet concealed under apparently opposite forms. The Church, as possessing the inspiration of the Spirit of Truth and Life has power to develope that germ into form and assign it a place in christian faith. It may be a process of many centuries. The very condemnation of the doctrine in the early church may have been part of the process. Thus the creed may grow; thus christianity is progressive. What it is to-day, may be very unlike what it was at first. To be a believer in the nineteenth century, may be a very different matter from what it was to be a believer in the second. Such is the theory on which the Church of Rome defends her infallibility in paying to the Virgin Mary a worship which Councils, whose authority she owns, condemned. Thus the Pope's new article of Faith, that of the Immaculate conception of Mary, makes necessary to salvation a belief which it is not pretended that any eye can detect in the scriptures

or in the teaching of the early centuries of the Church. Out of the Christianity of the Apostolic age, was developed that of the Nicene; out of the Nicene, the Mediæval; out of the last, the creed and decrees of the Council of Trent; out of the Romanism of Trent, the Ultra Montanism of the Italian Church in the days of Pius the ninth.

Such is the doctrine of Development, advocated in substance by Tractarians. If only Mr. Newman brought it out in fulness and by name, the whole doctrine of *Reserve*, so notoriously belonging to the Tract School, involves it in principle, and Tract No. 85, insinuates it continually. What is the teaching of the following extract? "The early Church always *did* consider scripture to be what I have been arguing from the structure of it, viz., a book with *very, recondite* meanings—not merely with reference to its teaching the particular class of doctrines in question," (including the Atonement, the Trinity, &c.,) "but as regards *its entire teaching*. They considered that it was *full of mysteries*, that the Church doctrines are *not on its surface*. It is also certain that the early Church did herself conceal these same doctrines. Viewing that early period as a whole, there is on the whole *a great secrecy* observed in it concerning such doctrines as the Trinity and the Eucharist, that is, the early Church did the very thing which I have been supposing scripture does, *conceal high truths*. If the early church had reasons for concealment, perchance scripture has the same; especially if we suppose, what at the very least is no very improbable idea, that the system of the early Church is a *continuation* of the system of those inspired men who wrote the New Testament."

Mark well the last sentence of this half concealing and cautiously developing exhibition of the Tractarian doctrine of Reserve. What is meant by "*continuation*?" If merely that the system of the early church was a *preservation* of an adherence to that of the inspired writers, why say that it is "no very improbable idea?" Then in what other sense was it a *continuation*? Why, of course, as *development* is a continuation; as the tree is a *continuation* of the sapling; as something so recondite as not to be recognised is *continued* when you see a complex system of doctrine imposed upon the

belief of men and are told it is that once recondite invisible something. Mr. Newman's full expansion of the doctrine of Development, in his book on that subject, was just such a *continuation* of the more hidden and recondite attempt to insinuate the same doctrine in the Tract from which the above is taken.

Now what is this whole doctrine but just the fundamental idea of the Rationalism of the seven Essays and Reviews, ehanging only the Church, as the *incubator*, for human reason? What else is the idca of one of the Essayists that "the human race is a colossal man?" The creeds of the Church, they say were "*evolved*" by the Church, which occupied six centuries "in the creation of a theology," a number of the decisions of which are now "*practically obsolete*." It is indicated "that there was a Bible before our Bible, and that some of our present books are expanded (developed) from simpler elements." An implied antagonism in Christianity to the intellectual convictions of mankind, one of the writers hopes may be removed, when it is considered whether the intellectual forms under which Christianity is described may not also be in a state of transition and revolution.

Now with this development doctrine thus in common to the Tract, the Romish and the Rationalistic systems, what is to hinder the last from taking the ground that the religion of the scriptures is a development from some previous religion or combination of previous religions and philosophies, as unlike it, as Buddhism is unlike Christianity? Why not if the Christianity of the New Testament has been legitimately developed into the present Pio Nono Romanism? Or what is to hinder the Rationalist of Oxford from legitimately holding that his whole system is a veritable development of the religion of the New Testament, going on to a further development of, he knows not what extent of positive infidelity, if Pio Nono, on the throne of universal supremacy, the centre of unity, infallible oracle of truth, Vicar of Christ, "sitting as God in the Temple of God," creating, at will, Articles of Faith, and conditions of salvation, is only a development of the office of Peter, the Apostle, as exhibited in the scriptures? Or, in fine, what hinders the conclusion that the present school of Rationalism



is a legitimate development of its predecessor, the Tractarian, if the latter be a true development of the doctrine of the Apostles? Whither this Rationalistic growth is to attain we know not. One thing we know that the Gospel truth has fought and conquered in battles as hard as these *septem contra Christum* can make. The Greeks, seeking after wisdom, and therefore treating the Gospel as foolishness, were in their day an adversary at least as strong as their followers in our day. When the powers of death could not hold the crucified Jesus—but HE ROSE; assurance was given to all ages that no enmity can finally prevail over Him or His Gospel. Through Him, and like Him, it is "*the Power of God.*"

